The Sun.

SUNDAY, NOVEMBER 28, 1880.

The regular circulation of THE SUN *for the week ending Nov. 27, 1880, was:*

Sunday	122,253	Weekly	89,175
Monday	111,774	Thursday	103,982
Tuesday	131,765	Friday	109,137
Wednesday	110,111	Saturday	110,747
Total for the week			888,944

THE SUN FOR 1881.

Everybody reads THE SUN. In the editions of this newspaper throughout the year to come everybody will find:

I. All the world's news, so presented that the reader will get the greatest amount of information with the least unprofitable expenditure of time and eyesight. THE SUN long ago discovered the golden mean between redundant fulness and unsatisfactory brevity.

II. Much of that sort of news which depends less upon its recognized importance than upon its interest to mankind. From morning to morning THE SUN prints a continued story of the lives of real men and women, and of their deeds, plans, loves, hates, and troubles. This story is more varied and more interesting than any romance that was ever devised.

III. Good writing in every column, and freshness, originality, accuracy, and decorum in the treatment of every subject.

IV. Honest comment. THE SUN's habit is to speak out fearlessly about men and things.

V. Equal candor in dealing with each political party, and equal readiness to commend what is praiseworthy or to rebuke what is blamable in Democrat or Republican.

VI. Absolute independence of partisan organizations, but unwavering loyalty to true democratic principles. THE SUN believes that the Government which the Constitution gives us is a good one to keep. Its notion of duty is to resist to its utmost power the efforts of men in the Republican party to set up another form of government in place of that which exists. The year 1881 and the years immediately following will probably decide this supremely important contest. THE SUN believes that the victory will be with the people as against the Rings for monopoly, the Rings for plunder, and the Rings for imperial power.

Our terms are as follows:

For the DAILY SUN, a four-page sheet of twenty-eight columns, the price by mail, post paid is *55* cents a month, or *$6.50* a year; or, including the Sunday paper, an eight-page sheet of fifty-six columns, the price is *65* cents a month, or *$7.70* a year, postage paid.

The Sunday edition of THE SUN is also furnished separately at *$1.20* a year, postage paid.

The price of the WEEKLY SUN, eight pages, fifty-six columns, is *$1* a year, postage paid. For clubs of ten sending *$10* we will send an extra copy free. Address I. W. ENGLAND,

Publisher of THE SUN, New York city.

Is the Democracy Dead?

We reproduce in another part of this paper one of the most noteworthy newspaper articles we ever met with. In this article the veteran editor of the *Chicago Times* declares with unwonted power and ardor what he conceives to be the chief cause for the defeat of the Democracy. This cause he pronounces permanent and resistless. He contends that the Democratic party has no possibility of success in the future, but is a dead, decaying and useless organization.

Our Chicago contemporary has always been as remarkable for frankness as for ability. The *Times* never fails to say just what it thinks, and say it plainly. Indeed, so outspoken has it been in the past that we remember very well, some fifteen or eighteen years ago, during the war of the rebellion, the military authorities laid a temporary embargo upon the *Times* as a flagrant copperhead, a Bourbon, hostile to the Union and to the war for its preservation, and unpatriotically friendly to the rebels and their cause.

How great a change between that day and this, when the *Times* pronounces the Democracy dead and rotten because of its relations to the rebellion; while we, who were then utterly opposed both to the Democratic party and its ultra Southern organ at Chicago, now attempt to defend the Democracy against the present animated and unsparing attack of that very organ!

It is true that before the war the Democracy was under the iron rule of the South. The South compelled it to reject Mr. VAN BUREN. The South refused to take a Northern statesman in the person of Mr. DOUGLAS. The South would have no man as the Democratic candidate for President except one sure to act in the interest of Southern domination; and when the South rebelled, it was the act of that faction which had long controlled the whole Democracy; and all through the war the Southern sympathizers were all of them Democrats.

Moreover, from the day the war began to the present, the Democracy has continued to be ruled, to an absurd extent, by the friends of Southern domination. In 1864 they made it pronounce the war a failure. In 1868 they rejected CHASE and took SEYMOUR. In 1872 they were compelled to nominate GREELEY, but they crushed him in the election. In 1876 they sold out TILDEN, after he had been elected; and in 1880 they were powerful enough to prevent his renomination. Then an undoubted Northern and Union man was selected in TILDEN's stead, and he was finally beaten at the polls through the very same faction which had forced his nomination.

These are facts that cannot be disputed. But all this is of the past. What is the situation of the present?

The Democracy stands for the foundation principles of the Constitution; for local self-government as opposed to centralization; for the restriction and diminution of the powers and the interference of government, and for the elevation and the untrammelled initiative and independence of the individual citizen; for equal rights as opposed to privilege and monopoly; for the Republic as opposed to the Empire. For these reasons we find ourselves constrained to think and act with the Democracy.

In any free republican government there must be a party of the people, in other words, a democratic party. Without such a party such a government cannot continue. Given a republic without a democratic party, and such a party must either be created or the republic perishes. In this country there is such a party. In the course of its long career, it has been mixed up with many things that were not democratic, but the very opposite of democratic; and yet it is sound at the core. It has survived such disasters that it seems as if nothing could kill it. Its vitality is intense. Its power is great. At the recent election, in spite of every obstacle, in spite of all the resources of the Republicans, the officeholders, the money, the partiality of business interests, the impulse of antagonism toward the possibility of a Southern restoration, in spite of the follies and stupidities of its own leadership, and of all the mighty influences so graphically depicted by the *Chicago Times*—in spite of all these, the Democracy had so many millions of votes that they came within a hair's breadth of carrying the country.

We have, then, a party of the people, not dead and seemingly not capable of dying. Such a party is necessary to free institutions; it is necessary to the perpetuation of liberty. Its spirit is potent and its organization strong, even when its appointed chiefs behave like idiots. In our judgment, the part of wisdom is to adhere to it, to maintain it, to reform it, and to carry it forward upon the path which JEFFERSON, JACKSON, and TILDEN have marked out. In that path is hope. In that path is safety for the republic.

Why are Half a Million People Away from Church To-day?

In a recent address at Boston the Rev. Dr. BELLOWS said that there are half a million of people in New York who do not go to church. He, of course, meant that there are that number among the population of the city old enough to attend worship of their own motion, among the inhabitants of adult age or near it.

Probably his figures are not far wrong. It is true that the churches afford accommodations for three or four hundred thousand persons, but, on the average, more than a third of the seats in the Protestant churches are unoccupied on Sunday. Even if that loss of about one hundred thousand is made up in the Roman Catholic churches, whose different services are attended by different congregations, there is still left the half million of whom Dr. BELLOWS speaks.

And, according to him, these people who stay at home from church are not the "ignorant and untutored." Neglect of religious observances is not so common among that class as among "men and women of culture and intelligence."

Here, too, he is probably right. Leaving out the Roman Catholic population of the city, of whom Dr. BELLOWS does not seem to speak, the majority of our inhabitants do not look on churchgoing as a duty. They are neglecting it more and more, and the class in which are included the largest proportion of absentees is the class of what he calls the cultured and intelligent.

It is among these that infidelity is spreading most rapidly. They are getting further and further away from the sort of Christianity preached in the churches. If it were not for the conservatism of women and their regard for religious observances, the congregations on Sunday could be got into less than a quarter of the churches, for a large part of the men go simply to please their wives. Of thorough, vital faith in the doctrines preached they have little. Of actual Christian practice they have next to nothing.

So universal is this absenteeism from church that it has become a question of much importance, Dr. BELLOWS thinks, whether the coming man will go to church at all. He means what he describes as the intelligent and cultured man, the man who is likely to sit in criticism on the doctrines preached.

Such a question implies a doubt as to the ability of the churches to hold their own against infidelity. And Dr. BELLOWS is not the only clergyman who is asking it. It comes from Connecticut, where the Congregational churches are, comparatively, much weaker then they were a quarter of a century ago. It is heard in Massachusetts, where absenteeism from church prevails even in small villages. It is this doubt which is leading religious conventions to inquire whether their creeds do not need to be readjusted and made to suit the spirit of the times. It was their conception of the danger which menaces the Church from the growth of infidelity and indifferentism which impelled the Bishops of the Episcopal Church to urge on their clergy and laity the necessity of illustrating more faithfully in their lives the teachings of Christianity.

How can we call New York a Christian city when half a million of its inhabitants, including a large proportion of the most intelligent among them, turn away from the churches as offering nothing worthy of their attention? How is this increasing tendency to neglect religious observances to be arrested? The preachers will do well to devote their first and most serious thought to discover the causes of the trouble and the means of removing them.

How Englishmen are Enlightened about America.

The comments of the London press on our recent political canvass have evinced an extraordinary ignorance of fundamental facts. If a New York newspaper were to perpetrate like blunders in its references to English politics, it would be a laughing stock to its own readers. Why is it that our current information concerning the United Kingdom is so much wider and more accurate than the knowledge of American affairs possessed even by educated people in the British Islands? One reason perhaps is that Englishmen who visit us or write to us endeavor to tell the truth, whereas some of our countrymen coin the most amazing fictions for circulation abroad. One of the latest and most brazen exhibitions of mendacity and gammon is an effusion in the *Contemporary Review*, purporting to emanate from an "American statesman."

There is something keenly ludicrous in the pompous appellation under which the author of this edifying article has chosen to disguise himself. It might be rash to assert the absolute non-existence of an American statesman, but it is safe to say that those who, in these latter days, have shown some capacity for genuine statecraft as distinguished from machine politics have not affected the designation, since Mr. W. M. TWEED saw fit to describe himself as "a modern statesman." Under all the circumstances, we think our legislators and officials display a becoming modesty in contenting themselves with the unpretentious title of politicians. The only exceptions to this rule that we can now call to mind were the useful instruments of the electoral conspiracy who, under the impressive name of "visiting statesmen," were despatched to New Orleans in the autumn of 1876. The honorable E. W. STOUGHTON figured in that imposing deputation, and it may be that this gentleman, having recovered from what he called his controversy with Judge BLACK in the *North American Review*, has consented to enrich the pages of the *Contemporary*.

Whatever its source, this lucubration is calculated to leave the British mind in a state of hopeless bewilderment and dense obscuration. The effect of its explanation recalls those similes to which, according to the author of "Hudibras," poor poets have recourse, and which leave a subject tenfold darker than it was before. It is painful to conceive the blank and dazed condition of the Englishman who lays down this paper after a strenuous effort to elicit some clear conception of American affairs. He was already dimly conscious of some gaps in his knowledge on this head, and probably felt a yearning to grasp the essential difference between the Democratic and the Republican parties, and especially to solve the inscrutable enigma how an individual accused of bribery and perjury, not by his enemies, but by his friends, could be elected Chief Magistrate of the American republic. Let us see how far he would be helped to answer these queries by an "American statesman."

The inquiring English reader will be balked at the outset by the information that "the names of the two great political parties" in the United States "mean nothing." This is, of course, a truism as regards the appellation of the Republican party, which calmly appropriated one-half of the name borne by the followers of JEFFERSON for three-quarters of a century. To add, however, that these terms, as at present used, "represent no difference of opinion as to the form of government," strikes us as a daring imposition on British credulity. The language is conveniently vague, but is meant to hide or contradict the indisputable fact that Jeffersonian Democrats are now, as they always have been, at variance with their opponents, whether designated as Federalists or Republicans, on the most vital of all questions, namely, Shall the Constitution be strictly or loosely construed, and is or is not the doctrine of implied powers pregnant with dangerous encroachments and innovations? After this unsatisfactory statement, the British student is perplexed to learn that although there is said to be no difference of opinion between the two parties just at present, yet the line of demarcation has been, according to the "statesman," very broad and deep indeed, up to a very recent period. During the war, he is assured, the Democratic party of the North sympathized with the rebellion, the fact being, as Mr. TRUMBULL has demonstrated from the records during the present canvass, that the Northern armies were actually recruited more largely from Democratic than from Republican voters. It is next asserted that since the war the "financial policy" of the Democrats has been "opposed to that carried out by the Republicans," and that their majority in Congress has been so used as to "startle and alarm the people of the North." Here, again, the English investigator of American politics will have to grapple with puzzling generalities. He will naturally marvel whether the Democrats, as a party, could have embraced the Greenback heresies, and what suspicious act or sinister tendency it was that had such power to astound and dismay the Northern mind. We are in the dark ourselves upon this point, although we can see there was a good deal in the attitude of the Democratic party to "startle" and "alarm" the Republican officeholders. It was this, perhaps, which the alleged statesman had in view, for he goes on to say that the "first care" of the Democratic leaders, if successful, would have been "to overturn the whole civil service, and to fill all the offices" with their own partisans. In order that the readers of the *Contemporary* may be duly impressed by this frightful prospect, they are allowed to imagine that our so-called "civil service" is modelled on their own. The statesman does not think it worth while to mention that every officeholder was heavily assessed during the late campaign for Republican party purposes, and thereby richly earned permanent deprivation of a salary which the whole people are taxed to pay.

After this lucid exposition of the large political questions involved in the late contest, our "American statesman" condescends to say a word about the candidates. With an assurance that can only be described as monumental, he informs the British public that the Republican party picked out as its nominee for President a man "universally respected," and who "has a spotless private character." We suppose that American newspapers do occasionally come within the ken of educated Englishmen, or, at all events, of writers for the press. If this be so, what impression will be derived from the cool affirmance of our instructive statesman touching the qualifications to "universal respect" and the standard of "spotless character" which obtain on this side of the Atlantic? Will they not reasonably argue that a charge of bribery and corruption on the part of a legislator, and the distinct implication of false swearing, although emanating from political associates, have really no weight at all in the forum of American morals, provided the sum of money involved is limited? Can they help inferring that Mr. GARFIELD's performances in the matter of the Credit Mobilier and the DE GOLYER contract are set down as only amiable weaknesses when compared with the gross obliquities proved against certain of his colleagues and popularly imputed to the mass of "American statesmen?" Must they not conclude that the American people did, in fact, accept on behalf of the Republican candidate the precise plea put forward in a well-known anecdote by an indiscreet young woman when confronted with a tangible evidence of frailty—"It was such a little one?"

On the whole, we may congratulate the readers of the *Contemporary* on their introduction to a specimen of what we are accustomed to call a campaign document. This characteristic outgrowth of our native literature they will find happily illustrated in the outgivings of the "American statesman." When, however, they desire to turn from pleasing coruscations to homely facts, we fear they will have to fall back on American newspapers.

Our Colored Brother in Politics.

Before general elections, Republican leaders are apt to profess uncommon regard for the colored brother. Stalwarts like Mr. BOUTWELL demand that the negro shall be put over the white man in the Southern States. In the desire to punish and to degrade the object of their unforgiving hatred, they take no heed of the consequences. In the light of the bitter experience of carpet-bag rule backed by negro Legislatures, these bigoted leaders contend that intelligence, property, and virtue should be again subjected to the domination of ignorance, barbarism, and vice. Mr. BOUTWELL, speaking on behalf of the Republican party, and certainly reflecting the sentiment of the most powerful element in its organization, insists that Gen. GARFIELD should start out with this programme inscribed on his banner and proclaimed in his inaugural address. Mr. CONKLING has gone even further than the ex-Secretary; and the other end of the party in this State, led by Mr. CURTIS and Mr. FENTON, with Mr. EVARTS as chief of staff, though less pronounced in their utterances, practically sustain these extreme views.

As a necessary result of such teachings, contests for seats in Congress are threatened from several Southern States. They are founded upon the expectation that the Republican House will revive the infamous practices of the Reconstruction era which THADDEUS STEVENS crystallized in a memorable phrase when, in a contested seat case, he asked: "Which is our scoundrel?" The seats of Democrats fairly elected by majorities of thousands were given to scalawags, carpet-baggers, and thieves, branded Republican, some of whom had a mere handful of votes as a working capital.

Another effect of this threatened sectional crusade is already visible. Crowds of adventurers, calling themselves Southern Republicans, have rushed to Washington to demand a recognition in the organization of GARFIELD's Cabinet. They claim to have achieved wonderful things in the Presidential campaign, and they would like to have the Post Office, the Interior, and one or two other departments; though they are willing to take anything they can get.

In this scramble for place and preferment, the colored brother is not named. He represents three-quarters of a million of voters in the South, and nearly as many more scattered over the country. Neither Mr. CONKLING, nor Mr. BOUTWELL, nor any of the Stalwarts, nor the "man-milliner politicians," propose to consider the black man in the new deal. He is a good party chattel and an excellent club to break the white man's head in the South. But it would never do to put him on a social or a political level with the white Republican of the North. During the era of Grantism, the illustrious PINCHBACK was kept suspended, like MAHOMET's coffin, in a Republican Senate for more than three years. The Senators had declared legal the Legislature which had elected him. The ladies of GRANT's court, however, held a council and decided that Mrs. PINCHBACK should not be received into their circle as the wife of a Senator. The Republican majority turned PINCHBACK out of doors with $17,000 from the public Treasury in his pockets. If there be the least sincerity in the professions of Mr. CONKLING, Mr. BOUTWELL, and the Stalwart leaders generally, the negro is entitled to real consideration. We shall soon see if GARFIELD will invite the colored brother into his Cabinet, or even admit him to his political councils. He is far more likely to make him a messenger, a waiter, or an official bootblack.

In good breeding, in propriety, in attention to duty, and in many other respects, Mr. BRUCE, the colored Senator from Mississippi, is the peer of any of the Imperial leaders, and the superior of most of them.

Facts About Life and Death.

There are no statistics more interesting and suggestive than the vital statistics of a great community. What are the prevailing diseases, how the mortality stands in comparison with that of other large collections of people, what classes of the population most easily fall a prey to death, and in what districts sickness and death are most rife, are all questions to which we get specific and accurate answers in vital statistics thoroughly gathered and scientifically prepared.

So far as the records of deaths are concerned, no one of the great capitals of the world exceeds New York in its facilities for making them as nearly perfect as it is possible for such a collection of facts to be. Indeed, few of them equal us in this respect. Our loose marriage laws and the difficulty of inducing clergymen to render returns of the weddings at which they officiate, prevent complete records of marriages. The returns of births are fuller than they used to be, but we cannot even yet rely on their accuracy. Of the deaths, however, we have records which make no omissions.

Let us, therefore, study the mortality statistics of New York for a single week. It is the week ending with Oct. 30, and may be taken as one of average health for the city, taking the present year through. The mean temperature for the seven days was about 45°, which is a salubrious medium, and the conditions as to humidity were favorable.

The number of deaths for the week was 543. Estimating the population of the city at 1,221,714, this gave an annual death rate of 23.11 per 1,000. According to the latest weekly returns, the annual death rate of the great capitals of Europe was: London, 21.6 per 1,000; Paris, 24.04; Berlin, 29.7; Vienna, 19.6; Rome 22.5; while Dublin showed the high rate of 32.9. It will therefore be seen that for health New York compares favorably with the chief European cities, taken on the average.

Of the 543 deaths for the week, 118 were of infants under one year, 167 under two years, 227 under five years. That is, 41.73 per cent. of the mortality was of children under five years. The deaths among children between five and ten were 34, which is a larger number than we find until we reach the ages between sixty and sixty-five, when it was 37. Of children between ten and fifteen years only two died, and of youths between fifteen and twenty only eight. After twenty and up to sixty the highest number of deaths occurred between the ages of twenty-five and thirty, 29; and the lowest between forty-five and fifty, 19. Of people between sixty and sixty-five, 37 died, while of those between sixty-five and seventy only 13 dropped off. The mortality among those of greater age was 40.

Of the deaths, 282 were of males and 261 of females. More than half the whole number, or 291, were in tenement houses, 65 in institutions, 167 in houses containing three families or less, 6 in hotels or boarding houses, 8 in rivers, streets, boats, &c. Leaving out 282 children not of a marriageable age, 73 of the deceased were single, 121 married, and 68 widowed. There were buried in the Calvary (Roman Catholic) Cemetery, 218, and 57 found interment in the pauper burial ground. The greatest number of deaths occurred in the Nineteenth Ward, 86, and the largest mortality was in that ward, and in the Seventeenth, 49; Twenty-second, 48; Twelfth, 39; Twentieth, 34; Eleventh, 33; Eighteenth, 30; Seventh, 24, and Ninth, 24. These are the crowded wards. There were no deaths in the Third Ward; in the First there was only one, and in the luxurious Fifteenth they numbered five only.

Consumption was the most destructive disease, and carried off 71 persons. Pneumonia destroyed 59; disease of the brain, 1; nervous system, 46; diphtheria, 43; diarrhoeal diseases, 31; Bright's disease and croup, 25 each; bronchitis and heart disease, 23 each; scarlatina, 15. And of deaths by violence the number was 21.

One Source of Heavy Taxation.

Every winter hundreds of able-bodied men, as capable of doing a full day's work as anybody, are supported in our charitable institutions. They live in idleness and grow fat. Of course, their support comes out of the taxpayers.

Many of these persons make a regular practice, year after year, of going into the country for the summer and returning to their accustomed easy public quarters when the cold weather comes on.

Too much pains cannot be taken never to exclude persons from institutions where they have a right to go; but on the other hand, much greater care ought to be practised to avoid saddling the overburdened taxpayers with the expense of supporting strong, healthy men who are simply too lazy to work.

The Real Obstacle to a Good City Government.

The explorations of a legislative committee are not required to discover the obstacles to a good government in this city. It is easy enough to see wherein and how our municipal administration could be made at once much cheaper as well as far more efficient; but when it comes to carrying into effect measures of retrenchment and reform, the process is found to be attended with the greatest difficulty.

There are two adverse interests, always at war with each other. The one is the interest of the great mass of our citizens, who want a cheap government, characterized by the same energy and efficiency that are requisite to success in any practical business.

Opposed to this interest are the professional politicians, who want as many places created as possible, with liberal pay attached.

There is no difference between the two political parties in this respect. One is as bad as the other, and both are as bad as can be.

The worst of all is that when a body of professed reformers come forward, they immediately develop the same inordinate desire for office, though at first they partially cloak their designs.

The difficulty in the case is not in the diagnosis of the disease, but in discovering and applying a remedy.

"The time has come when there is an immense amount of thinking done quietly and unostentatiously about this great question of religion, and it is no longer settled by ministers on Sunday, but is considered and pondered over by laymen every day in the week." So said the Rev. Dr. BELLOWS at Boston. But, so far as the Church is concerned, the trouble about this quiet lay thought is that it is leading the thinkers to reject vital religious doctrines or to reject the Church itself because it fails to live up to its own teachings. It is a very serious and earnest infidelity, but it is infidelity all the same, to which this immense amount of thinking is bringing men.

A weekly journal entitled *Nym Crinkle's Feuilleton* has just been commenced in this city by Mr. A. C. WHEELER. It is devoted to dramatic and artistic subjects. It is very handsomely printed, and has a few appropriate and beautiful illustrations. No man is more competent than Mr. WHEELER to conduct a periodical of this kind. He is one of the most accomplished writers of the American press. His learning is extensive, his critical faculty unsurpassed, and his mode of expressing his ideas exceedingly readable and attractive. We cordially wish for his new enterprise the most complete and extensive success.

We find the following interesting bit of intelligence in the columns of the *Springfield Republican:*

"SAMUEL J. TILDEN has had a monument of blue granite made at the granite works in Westerly. It is 13 feet 4 inches high, and the name TILDEN appears on one side of the base in polished letters."

There is another monument far more majestic and enduring on which this name is most honorably and most indelibly inscribed. That monument is the history of the United States.

When the Rev. JAMES FREEMAN CLARKE said at the great temperance meeting in Boston that in order to promote temperance he "would even have saloons where there is lager beer," some of the audience hissed. And when he said further that lager beer was better than whiskey, the hisses were renewed. And yet these remarks showed him to be a wise temperance reformer. The usual trouble with the temperance people is that they defeat their object by going to extremes against which human nature rebels.

WHAT IS GOING ON IN EUROPE.

Queen Victoria has been getting into hot water with the German court. Her daughter, the Crown Princess, during her last visit to England, had a serious quarrel with her mother about some private matters, and this quarrel has not yet been made up, despite a visit of the Empress of Germany to Windsor Castle in the capacity of mediator. The Crown Princess, since her marriage, has gained the reputation of being a regular spitfire, and it is generally believed that, when her husband succeeds to the throne, both he and Bismarck will have rather a hard time of it to retain the reins of government in their own hands. Another cause of domestic grievance between the courts of London and Berlin is that the Queen has encouraged young Prince William of Prussia to marry the girl he loves. This has given great offence to the Empress, who thinks Prince William is marrying beneath him. Still another offence, in the eyes of the Empress, has been the Queen's active interest in promoting the marriage of the Princess Frederika of Hanover with one of her father's orderlies. In the midst of this storm in a teapot the Queen is enjoying herself after her fashion at Balmoral, although winter has set in. Her amusements are not of an exciting character; they consist mainly in walks to the village to visit her pet poor. She likes Balmoral for the bracing air, which has an excellent effect on her health and spirits.

The Local Government Board of London has issued its yearly report, which shows that the milk supply of the city amounts to 23,000,000 gallons a year, and that one-quarter of this amount is given by the cow with the iron tail. It cannot be pleasant for the Londoners to be informed that they spend about $400,000 a year for this quantity of water. And the knowledge is made more distasteful by the statement that this water is not always pure, and that the germs of all sorts of disease are conveyed by this adulterated mixture. It must be confessed that forty cents a gallon for foul water is rather an imposition. This is the price which the unfortunate Londoners pay, according to the report of the Local Government Board.

An effort is being made to revive the notorious Argyle Rooms in Windmill street, and the application for a license has been supported by the report of the Police Superintendent of the district. That officer points out what has long been apparent to all but the religious bigots of the metropolis, that the suppression of the Argyle Rooms, always an orderly establishment—except on boat race and Derby nights, when the whole neighborhood was converted into a pandemonium—has distributed through the district bordering on Piccadilly Circus the loose characters that were wont to assemble at the Casino. The consequence is that the attempt to suppress vice has driven it rampant through the streets, much to the annoyance of the inhabitants.

Sims Reeves, the popular English tenor, has written to the newspapers, offering his services as local instructor to the Royal College of Music on his retirement from the stage, which he announces will take place in 1882. The most important part of this extraordinary announcement is that Mr. Reeves postpones his retirement until 1882. He is now 59 years old, and must be very rich, for he has had for years past more engagements than he could attend to, and his terms have been the largest paid to any English vocalist. Nearly fifteen years ago it was an open secret among English musicians that Sims Reeves's voice had departed, and that he had been forced to have his music transposed into a lower key. Like all other persevering and money-making artists, he was accustomed to prepare his new songs under the advice of a master, and when that master informed him that he sang the song perfectly, he made it a rule to practise it one hundred times more before he ventured to sing it in public.

The banquet of the Lord Mayor of London took place on its customary day at Guildhall. About nine hundred guests sat down to dinner. The company began to arrive as early as 5 o'clock and assembled in the library, at one end of which a dais had been erected, on which the Lord Mayor awaited the arrival of the more distinguished personages. These were honored with a flourish of trumpets on their entrance. The guest of the evening, Mr. Gladstone, made his appearance shortly before 7 o'clock. On assembling at dinner, Lady Truscott acted for the Lady Mayoress, who was prevented from being present by family affliction. Mr. Gladstone and Mr. Challemel-Lacour sat at the Lord Mayor's right hand, and on his left were seated the Countess Spencer, the late Lord Mayor, and the Lord Chancellor. Among the company present were the Ministers of the United States, Spain, Persia, and Japan. After the usual toasts had been duly acknowledged, M. Challemel-Lacour made a graceful little speech in answer to the toast of "The Foreign Ambassadors," in which he declared that "the inauguration of the Lord Mayor was one of the most English things to be found in England." It has always been the custom for the Prime Minister to respond to the toast of "Her Majesty's Ministers," and the public looks forward to his utterances on these occasions with some anxiety. His speech is the first opportunity it has of learning something about the conduct of affairs since the prorogation of Parliament. The Prime Minister is expected to give some hint of the course the Government intends to pursue in the next session of the Lords and Commons. Of course the Prime Minister is ready and willing enough to speak of what he and his colleagues have done, but as to their course in the future it is most difficult for him not to let out secrets which it would be prejudicial to the public interests to disclose prematurely. Lord Beaconsfield was noted for his ability to "beat about the bush" and say a great deal without compromising himself. Mr. Gladstone, however, is supposed to be more straightforward, and the newspapers are eagerly conned in order to discover what may be the drift of the Government in home and foreign affairs.

This year the public must have felt disappointed. Mr. Gladstone was unusually reticent, and refused to show his hand, probably because he had very few trumps in it. In regard to Irish affairs he informed the country of what they already knew—speaking about the abundant harvests in that island and the great disappointment he felt that this amelioration in the condition of the country had not been followed by any improvement in its political aspects. He then went on to say that "in regard to law, Parliament had been too long accustomed to legislate for Ireland in a spirit of narrowness, and to leave upon the annals of the country little but the records of severity and oppression. Therefore it would be the duty of the Government to carefully examine the condition of the law with reference to the wants of Ireland, and, if they find occasion to believe that its provisions are insufficient for the great objects connected with the happiness of the people to which they ought to be addressed, they will not scruple to call upon the legislature to again apply itself to the subject, in the full confidence that they will deal with it in that spirit of equity and justice which has for a series of years marked its proceedings."

As to the disturbances instigated by the Land League, he remarked that with the improved condition of the people, in consequence of the good harvest, which should naturally have made them more contented, other influences had come upon the scene. "Objects, some of them perhaps legitimate, others more questionable, have been pursued by means that cannot for a moment pretend to the title of being legitimate, and that are totally incompatible with the first conditions of a well-constituted society." He then pointed out that the Government had a prior duty even to that of doing justice to Ireland, and that was the preservation of law and order. "This is not a question," he said, "where it may be urged that Ireland is visiting upon England the consequences of old oppression. It is not England that is being punished, it is Ireland herself. We hold it our first duty to look to the law as it stands, to ascertain what its fair and just administration means. But the obligation incumbent on us to protect every citizen in the enjoyment of his life and property might, under certain circumstances, compel us to ask for an increase of power and authority."

It has been for some time a secret of Punchinello in Paris that, if it had not been for the strenuous opposition of M. Lagarde, Sr., Jeanne Samary, the pretty *sociétaire* of the Théâtre Français would, at least a year ago, have become Mme. Lagarde, Jr. In France, as everybody knows, the parental consent is an indispensable condition to matrimony. If a stern father withholds his affirmative response the marriage must be postponed until he shall relent. Such, alas! was the predicament of poor M. Lagarde, the younger. His father, whom all Paris has been execrating as its most cross-grained inhabitant, refused for over a year to consent. What made it all the more reprehensible was the fact that Mlle. Samary was known to be as virtuous as she is clever and pretty. True, she has a single fault—that of invariably showing her teeth on the stage, merely because they happen to be as pearly a set of teeth as one could wish to see. But, somehow or another, the younger Lagarde at last managed to extort his father's approbation of the match, and Mlle. Samary became Mme. Lagarde—first at the Mairie of the Ninth Arrondissement, and afterward at the Church of the Trinity. The fact was gleefully commented upon by the newspapers that the bride had played during the winter the part of *Isabella* in "Daniel Rochat." She has assisted at the exaltation of the religious rite over the civil formality. Directly after she had said "yes" to an ugly looking functionary sitting behind a plain desk, she went to the theatre to play *Nicole* in the "Bourgeois Gentilhomme." But the religious marriage, next day, was a very different affair. The church was full. All the first-nighters in Paris trooped to the spectacle, in order to see the real wedding of the charming actress, who had been a fictitious bride a hundred times. There was even a baby among the spectators, who added its shrill cries to the murmur of expectation. By and by the procession arrived. Everybody was on tiptoe to gaze at the celebrities who had come to see her off. The whole staff of the Comédie Française passed in review—Mesdames Brohan, Lloyd, Bianca, Reichembourg, Messieurs Mauvant, the brothers Coquelin, Mounet-Sully, and the rest. The bride affected no false or theatrical diffidence. She smiled on her acquaintance, actually nodded to a friend or two, and clung to the arm of the blushing groom with an air of pride rather than of timidity. The curious observed with interest that in the region reserved for the relatives of the wedded pair the Samary family predominated. At last the ceremony began. Caron sang the *O Salutaris;* Bosquin followed in the *Ave Maria.* Then Grisy and Caron joined in a duet with chorus, "God of Abraham;" and then the actual wedding took place. Curiously enough, the bride, who had been married so often on the stage, forgot whether she must put the ring on her left hand or on her right. In a few minutes the affair was over; two lovely girls took up a collection for the poor, and the happy pair drove off, not for a honeymoon, but for a week's holiday, since the relentless M. Perrin refuses to give his pretty *pensionnaire* a longer vacation.

Edwin Booth has recovered in some degree from the chilling reception with which he was greeted by the London critics on his first appearance in *Hamlet.* They pronounced him with one accord a careful and intelligent actor, but too formal and precise in his methods. His *Richelieu,* however, has effected a complete revolution of sentiment. The same judges who set him down as a mere scholiast, now declare that he is an admirable artist, endowed with unsuspected resources of passion and force. This sudden revelation of his actual powers in a character so artificial as that of Bulwer Lytton's *Richelieu,* has set the essayists to work proving that, though Shakespeare may have been a great poet, he did not write plays to be acted with advantage in modern times. This heresy is spreading, and thus the fact that Shakespeare invariably spells bankruptcy for the manager who produces his works is beginning to be rationally explained, on the ground that his works are really not adapted to performance upon the modern stage.

A dramatization of "Nana" is in rehearsal at the Ambigu, and is to be presented with a realism worthy of Zola himself. Among the features of the performance will be the simulated small-pox of the lady who impersonates *Nana.* In the play, as in the novel, the heroine dies of that hideous malady, and all Paris is anxious to see this last step in dramatic pathology. The poison scene of the "Sphynx" will hereafter rank below the variolous finale of "Nana."

Literary Paris is unamiable at the present moment over a decision of the courts that the children of a first marriage have a right to share in the royalties and copyrights of an author who has married again and raised a second family. It is argued that, inasmuch as the second wife usually contributes more or less to the literary success of her husband, there is some reason in protesting against the recent judgment, on the ground that it trespasses upon her rights, and diminishes her share of the joint prosperity. N. L. T.

SUNBEAMS.

—Four colored nuns, of the Order of Sisters of Providence have gone to St. Louis to teach in St. Elizabeth's school in that city.

—At Forsyth Street Methodist Church, ex-prize fighter Howell Gardner has been assisting Brother Moorhouse in revival work.

—Of the $665,000 appropriated by the Methodists to missionary work, $170,000 is for the benefit of English-speaking nations.

—The Rev. Dr. Newman says that Evangelist Harrison, the so-called "Boy Preacher," is "the Lord's ram's horn, at whose blasts the walls of Jericho topple to their fall."

—"Spiritual Corns and Bunions" was the subject of a sermon recently announced at Kenosha, Wis. It is thought that the Kenosha pastor must have been wearing tight boots that week.

—The Rev. G. Woolsey Hodge, secretary of the Free Church Association, says that his society does not claim that the renting of pews is sinful, but only that it is inconsistent with the true idea of the church.

—The Rev. Dr. Paddock of St. Peter's Episcopal Church, Brooklyn, will be consecrated Bishop of Washington Territory on the 15th of December, and will at once go to his new field of labor. The sudden transition from the luxury of the City of Churches to the wilds of the far Northwest in midwinter will be a rare Christian experience for the Doctor.

—At the Five Points House of Industry eighteen hundred hungry men, women, and children were fed on Thanksgiving Day, without regard to cards of introduction or other forms of etiquette. They were devoutly grateful and exhibited their gratitude by stuffing themselves with as much as they could hold. Some of them looked as if they had not eaten a good meal since they were last washed.

—The Rev. W. A. P. Martin, D. D., President of the Imperial College at Peking, China, has been for some months in this country, but has now sailed for Europe. He has a long leave of absence from his duties among the Celestials, which he intends to improve by traveling in the principal countries of Europe and gathering information concerning their various systems of education. The results of his investigations are to be laid before the Chinese Government.

—Moody and Sankey are battling with sin in San Francisco, and, although they are drawing great crowds, they find the sinners of that wicked city quite as obdurate as they had expected. Mr. Sankey took 550 hymn books with which to commence the campaign, intending with these to "hold the fort" until reënforcements should arrive. A careful census of the lot remaining a few evenings ago showed that sinners or others had helped themselves to all but about 100 of these aids to evangelical worship. The singing went on, nevertheless, and there was an enthusiastic chorus of praise under the magnetic influence of Mr. Sankey, who was in no wise discouraged by the fact that he had unwittingly been sowing so much gospel seed on stony soil.

—In George Muller's Orphanage, Bristol, England, there are now five buildings capable of accommodating 2,100 orphans. Admission to the Orphanage is granted on the conditions that the children are orphans, that they are legitimate, and that they are destitute. Boys are cared for until they are fourteen, and girls until they are seventeen. It is taken for granted that all who are healthy are by this time able to support themselves. Those who are invalids are specially provided for. There are constant applications for servants, and these are filled from among the graduating orphans. For some time the demand has exceeded the supply. The training which the children receive in morals and manners admirably fits them for duty among people desiring a superior class of help.

—A lively discussion has arisen concerning the ministers of the Reformed Church and their stated preaching on the Heidelberg Catechism. There is a rule of the Church requiring that this solid old compendium of orthodox faith shall be regularly preached about by each and every minister. A religious paper recently said that most of the ministers regard this as such a bore that they disregard the rule, and omit to preach on the Catechism. The *Christian Intelligencer* takes up the cudgels in behalf of the accused ministers, and sends for definite information on the subject. It is a rule of each Classis that the ministers shall report once a year as to whether they have obeyed the law as to the Catechism or not. The reports are all accessible, and the *Christian Intelligencer* hopes, after gathering them, to convince the world of the falsity of the accusation that has been made.

—In a Tennessee Baptist church tableaux were given as a means of filling an exhausted treasury. In one of these the pastor appeared, holding a married lady in something like an apparently affectionate embrace. The position these good people assumed was that which was required by the scene represented. They both declared that they did not mean to be affectionate to each other, but only to seem so. The lady's husband took offence at what he considered undue familiarity and affection on the part of the parson, and held that the latter gentleman had not merely seemed to be affectionate. A lively quarrel resulted. No blood was shed, nor were blows exchanged, but there was a great deal of threatening. The upshot of the matter was the resignation of the pastor and his leaving the place. The church is now in want of a minister, and none but aged and wrinkled ones are recommended to apply.

—Brother Pentecost, the Baptist evangelist whose fame has become world wide, has for some years employed himself in preaching from place to place and has had no church to take care of. He now finds rest for the sole of his ecclesiastical foot in settling with the Tompkins Avenue Congregational Church in Brooklyn. This church was formed on the ruins of an unsuccessful Presbyterian one, and although it has had two or three pastors, has never yet attained that measure of success which might be expected for the respectable community in whose centre it is, or for the elegant house of worship which it occupies at a moderate rental. The expectation now is that Mr. Pentecost will put new life into it and achieve the complete success which its early promoters hoped for. Mr. Pentecost was formerly pastor of the Hanson Place Baptist Church, and left that position owing to his holding more liberal views on communion than were acceptable there. He is still a believer in immersion, but contends boldly for the largest gospel liberty in matters on which there may legitimately be a diversity of opinion among Christians.

—The English Church Union has a number of branches, one of which is in Bristol. This branch recently held a soiree and fair, at which fancy goods were exhibited and speeches were made. Some of these speeches gave utterance to radical views on the matter of church reform and management. Prominent among these was that of the Rev. Mr. Compton, who spoke on "Discipline in the Church." He lamented the almost total absence of spiritual discipline, and said that through its acknowledged want every one in England is reckoned as belonging to the Church, whatever his opinions may be. Mr. Compton was particularly severe on the Bishops, accusing them of being too big for their work. He advocated a less consequential class of men for Bishops, with considerably less pay than is now customary. A British Bishop now receives not less than $15,000, our money, for his salary. Mr. Compton says that the demand is for men who will be glad to do the work for one-fourth of that amount. The intimation is that the latter sum is about what the work is worth, the remainder being for the style the Bishop puts on.

—The book called "Scotch Sermons" has made a wonderful stir in the Established Church of Scotland. It is charged that they contain denials of no less than twelve of the leading doctrines set forth in the Presbyterian Confession of Faith. They question the authority of some parts of the Gospels, and throw doubt on the authenticity of several of the miracles as recorded. An attempt to bring the writers to ecclesiastical justice has been made in Presbytery, but has not as yet been a success, the Presbytery being largely tinctured with the same alleged heterodoxy. The matter will be carried to Synod and to General Assembly. There is a prospect of quite as lively a controversy over this sermon book as that which has almost rent the Free Church of Scotland in the Robertson Smith discussion. The ultra-orthodox men are alarmed at the spread of heresy, and those who are in sympathy with the newer views tell the ultra-orthodox not to be alarmed, for even if the views promulgated are not exactly in sympathy with those of the Westminster Confession, they are in accordance with those set forth in the Scriptures. The ultra-orthodox, on the other hand, claim that the Westminster Confession and the Bible are in perfect harmony.

—The Sunday school lesson of to-day brings Jacob the patriarch before Pharaoh the King. The passage to be studied is Genesis, xlvii., 1-12. The golden text is "the hoary head is a crown of glory if it be found in the way of righteousness." Joseph had sent his brothers back to Canaan after revealing himself to them. They carried with them not only a liberal supply of food for the immediate wants of their father and his household, but an invitation from Joseph for the whole family to come and make themselves at home in Egypt. Jacob accepted this invitation, and brought his dependents, numbering in all seventy people. Joseph assigned them a dwelling place in the land of Goshen, which was a well watered grazing territory in the northeastern part of Egypt. Jacob was rich in flocks and herds, which he brought with him. He and his sons supposed they were seeking and finding a temporary refuge from famine, possibly intending to return after a few months or years. The journey into Egypt proved, however, to be the beginning of a stay which continued until the descendants of Jacob, multiplied into a great people, were led out by Moses. Pharaoh received Jacob with great courtesy, asking him how old he was. The patriarch replied, with a sigh at the sorrowful experiences through which he had struggled, that his age was 130 years. As he departed from the presence of Pharaoh he received from the monarch a kingly blessing, and then quietly went to settle down in the retirement of Goshen. Jacob lived for seventeen years after this. He took no part in public affairs, and we hear nothing more of him until his death bed scene, which forms the lesson for next Sunday. The moral of this lesson is that those of us who do not die in the prime of life must grow old, and that we should learn to grow old in such a way that old age may be happy and full of glory. Jacob had suffered much in his earlier life, but his old age was sunshiny and full of honor.